



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Medea of Euripides. With an Introduction and Commentary by A. W. Verrall, M. A. London. Macmillan & Co. 1881.

To say that this book deserves a hearty welcome may seem too much to the captious critic—possibly too little to the generous critic. It has good qualities which render it conspicuous among the products of recent scholarship, especially of Anglo-American scholarship. The book shows conscientious and systematic industry, real knowledge of critical method, very uncommon ingenuity. The reader who examines a couple of pages taken at random will find his expectations raised very high. But he will reluctantly find these expectations in some measure disappointed upon careful study of the whole. For although the tools are those of the scientific workman, they sometimes slip strangely as from lack of practice; the very fertility of critical resource sometimes appears as overwrought cleverness missing a plain point; and there is sometimes a certain haziness of feeling about the way things may and may not be said in Greek. But the fulness of examination which I shall try to give the book may be taken as evidence that I do not fail to appreciate its merits.

The Introduction (dated May, 1881) begins with a list of editions chiefly used. The names of Kirchhoff, Weil and Schöne are conspicuous by their absence. Whether the *Analecta Euripidea* of Wilamowitz have been studied at first hand is not quite clear. It is matter of real regret that V. published too early to have seen Leo's remarks (Hermes, XV 306. See Amer. Jour. of Philol. I 437), to which I shall repeatedly refer. Next follows an attempt to provide a sort of royal road for those who cannot or will not learn by close study what manner of thing a Greek manuscript is. V. gives a bit of *Comus*, full of imaginary corruptions found in imaginary manuscripts, and then goes through the process of correcting it according to art. The idea is a clever one; but it may be doubted whether such a device can do more than to raise a conceit of knowledge in the indolent. A good photographic facsimile of twenty well chosen lines from the Codex Laurentianus would have been worth far more to real students.

The discussion of the two classes of MSS of Euripides which follows is more important. V. is right out of all question in supporting the high authority of the Laurentianus and Palatinus; but I cannot think he (or anybody else as yet) has fully solved the problem of the relation of these MSS to the Vaticanus. My own provisional view is that the MSS of the "second class" (Laur. and Pal.) are more genuine, though more corrupted by slips and errors; while the Vaticanus has been more corrected out of shape by grammarians. And so far as this statement goes, I understand it to state Verrall's view. But this view will not support the load of inferences which he puts upon it. There is nothing in it to diminish the probability, in any given case of divergence,

that the Vaticanus may have the genuine reading, provided the divergence can be best explained on that theory. Let us look for a moment at one of the passages which V. discusses in this connection. In 668 he thinks ἐσάλης a gloss, *ικάνεις* a corruption, and writes *ιζάνεις*. To begin with, ἐσάλης is a perfect reading on its own merits. Then V.'s argument, "ἐσάλης is familiar and easy, *ικάνεις* poetical and archaic," and again, "whatever else may be said of *ικάνεις*, no one will take it for an explanation or correction of ἐσάλης," is all wrong. The scholion to this very passage proves that ἐσάλην was *not* familiar to Byzantine readers; and *ικάνω* was well known to every Byzantine school-boy as a part of the antique poetical vocabulary—an admirable word for a gloss. This a man really practised in such matters would know by a sort of instinct; but no doubtful matter could be easier of investigation. For example, it is not hard to examine the other passages of Euripides in which the passive of στέλλω occurs. The first upon which the writer stumbles is Androm. 251. That line, with its variants and *glossemata*, tells the whole story with curious neatness. Other flaws in the argument of this essay must be passed over. The remaining portions of the Introduction deal with the Story of Medea, the "Two Versions," the Medea of Neophron, the Scenery and Distribution of the Parts.

I shall now ask the reader to accompany me in an examination of most of the passages in which V. prints emendations of his own. In 30 he proposes, 'under reserve,' *πλὴν εἰ ποτε* for *ἦν μὴ ποτε*. Here as elsewhere in the play recourse is had to capital letters to show how easily the corruption could have crept in. But in fact the correction is, as a matter of palaeography, very improbable, even with the help of capital letters. And most scholars familiar with the manuscripts of Euripides will probably agree with the reviewer that later forms of Byzantine writing are generally of higher importance in accounting for corruptions. In the present case *πλὴν εἰ ποτε* does not at all give the needed sense; it leaves the connection of thought as absurd as ever. What we want is *καὶ δὴ ποτε*; and there is strong reason, apart from the necessary sense, for supposing that Euripides wrote *καὶ δὴ ποτε*. The reading of the Laurentianus proves that the *δὴ* was extant in the archetype of L and P; while the uncertainty of the copyists about the breathing of *ἦν* points to an archetype which had *ἦν* without breathing. Now let the reader unfamiliar with manuscripts turn to Bücheler's edition of the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, the edition with the facsimile of the manuscript. There let him compare the *καὶ* of v. 90 with the last two letters of *θαλερῆν*, v. 79. In 39 V. objects to ἐγῴδα τήνδε on the ground that *οἶδα* is the wrong verb and *τήνδε* the wrong pronoun. This is obviously true. By the way, Wecklein's note on this passage is a beautiful specimen of the habit of supporting one construction by citing an example of some other: he cites Phoen. 716, ἐγῴδα κείνους τοῖς λόγοις ὄντας θρασείς. But V. urges his objection with strange modesty: ("I would speak with the greatest diffidence of difficulties which others have not found"). Dindorf and Prinz have declared the verse spurious; nor can the condemnation be removed by V.'s change of *τήνδε* to *τῇδε*. In 123-4 he accepts Barthold's conjecture, ἐπὶ μὴ μεγάλοις, but omits the *τε* of the next line. He says: "ὁχρῶς τ' MSS, but the corruption of the previous word accounts readily for the insertion of the copula." But surely the *τε* is wholly inconsistent with, and in itself a proof of

the corruption of εἰ μὴ μέγας, while in the corrected text there is not the faintest objection to it. This is pointed out by Leo. In 157 κοινὸν τότε · μὴ χαράσσου is a very simple and complete restoration.

In 182 the change εἰ τὰδ' ἀδᾶ can hardly be considered fortunate. The traditional reading is perfectly sound and has been well explained and sufficiently illustrated by Pflugk and Klotz: the τὰδε is in antithesis to τὰ ἔσω.

234 Verrall prints in this form: λαβεῖν · λαβεῖν γὰρ οὐ, τόδ' ἄλγιον κακόν. Surely λαβεῖν γὰρ οὐ (=τὸ γὰρ μὴ λαβεῖν) gives the negative a prominence not easily explained. Prinz is right in rejecting the line, and V. wrong in saying there is nothing to account for an interpolation. The verse belongs to a recognized class of interpolations, of which we have here to perfection the usual characteristics, a *superfluous* word intended to fill out the sense of the preceding verse, and then five feet of halting nonsense (generally with variants enough to show that some ancient grammarians conscientiously tried to cure congenital defects) by way of padding out the rhythm.

303-5 is a very troublesome passage, and V. does "not pretend to certainty about it." He prints: σοφὴ γὰρ οὖσα, τοῖς μὲν εἰμ' ἐπίφθορος, | τοῖς ἡσυχαίοις, τοῖς δὲ θατέρου τρόπου | τοῖς δ' αὖ προσάντης εἰμὶ κοῖνὴ ἄγαν σοφή. This involves considerable changes, and cannot, in spite of all explanation, give an acceptable sense. The real trouble is that the verses are not Euripidean. Many critics have recognized the fact of interpolation here (Pierson, Brunck, Musgrave Porson, Elmsley, Dindorf, Nauck, Kirchhoff, Hirzel, Prinz, Wecklein, Allen, and I know not how many more); but no one seems to me to have exercised a proper tact in defining its limits. V.'s objections to assuming an interpolation are of no weight as such, but they are decisive against any definition of the spurious matter hitherto proposed. The reviewer believes 302-305 (ἐγὼ δὲ—σοφῇ) to be spurious. The interpolator, in his overweening sapience, thought he might do dull-witted Jason a kindness by pointing out an application for the general principle of 300-301. But in fact the personal application has been already given in 292-3. On this view the reader will see the meaning of δ' οὖν, 306, and will not be tempted to follow V. in writing αὖ for οὖν. It may be remarked here that the manuscript evidence, on which some critics have relied in rejecting 304, really proves nothing whatever.

The treatment of 359-61 is very unsatisfactory. V. gives *προξενίαν* in 359 and omits (as others have done) *ἐξευρήσεις* of 361. But even if *προξενίαν* were the reading of the MSS, we should, on cutting out *ἐξευρήσεις*, be warranted in writing *πρὸς ξενίαν*. And the case is really far stronger than this: *προξενίαν* has no authority whatever beyond that of bare conjecture; the diplomatic facts make it certain that not only the Vaticanus, but also the common archetype of the Laurentianus and of the Palatinus, as well as some progenitor of the Parisinus 2713, had *πρὸς ξενίαν* and nothing else. The reviewer is satisfied that Leo is right in trying to cure the trouble by emendation of *ἐξευρήσεις*. His change to *ἐξευρήσουσ'* leaves nothing to be desired.

In 392 V. writes *ἀμήχανον* instead of *ἀμήχανος*. But there is no need of emendation, only of explanation, of a little consideration how *ἀμήχανος* comes to acquire its derived meaning of *irresistible*. Primarily a thing is *ἀμήχανος* when it carries no devices with it, when it leaves the person concerned without devices, whether for resistance to itself or for any other suggested purpose.

That is the sense required here: the ἀμήχανος συμφορά of which Medea is thinking is an exile without promise of any πύργος ἀσφαλής. To find examples of ἀμήχανος in its primary sense as applied to things is less difficult than V. supposes: such examples are numerous in Euripides. I will cite only Hec. 1123, for which Verrall's statement of the meaning of the adjective (*that against which devices are weak or powerless, hard, irresistible, not to be prevented*) is singularly inadequate.

434-7 V. writes as follows: πέτρας, ἐπὶ δὲ ξένα ναίεις χθονί· τᾶς ἀνάνδρος κοίτας ὀλέσασα λέκτρων, τάλαινα. To this I will only say that the traditional text, in which I can see no fault, seems to me far simpler, clearer, better both in sense and in grammar. The chorus tell the story of Medea's misfortunes in historical sequence and with something of the effect of rhetorical climax. In delusion of heart she left her father's house and braved the terrors of a frightful journey; she is now a dweller in a land of strangers, where [she has lost the hope and comfort of her marriage; she is on the verge of exile even from her adopted land.

The reading of 494 is worth a moment's notice. The overwhelming weight of authority is for θέμι' ἀνθρώποις. V. writes θέσμ' ἐν ἀνθρώποις, because "it is difficult to account for" the variant θέμι' ἐν unless ἐν be a part of the original reading. But nothing is easier than to account for this variant, if one bears in mind the character of the old grammar-rules. The schoolboy who had to account for the case of ἀνθρώποις was expected to say: λείπει ἡ ἐν. Grammatical notes of this sort from the margins of the manuscripts are familiar to readers of scholia.

738-9 V. writes: ψιλὸς γένοι' ἂν κάπικηρυκεύματα | οὐκ ἀντιστοῖο. This is too ingenious. Beside this Leo's ὀκνῶν πίθοιο in 739 seems a remedy as sound as it is simple.

835-45 are treated at length—and very interestingly treated—in an excursus. No passage could be better selected than this to exhibit the editor's great ingenuity. He writes: τοῦ καλλιάνου τ' ἀπὸ Κηφισοῦ ῥοᾶς, τὰν Κύπριν κλήζουσιν ἀφυσσομένην χώραν καταπλεῖνσαι μετρίους ἀνέμων ἡδυνήνοισι ὁάροις, αἰεὶ δ' ἐπιβαλλομένην χαίταισιν εὐδὼν ῥοδέων πλόκον ἀνθέων τᾷ σοφίᾳ παρέδρους πέμπειν ἔρωτας, παντοίας ἀρετᾶς ξυνεργούς. This is very clever; the translation and explanation given with it are very attractive; but any cautious critic must hesitate to find it all conclusive. I will offer only one remark: the adjective μετρίους becomes suspiciously prosaic when made to do duty for the ἀνέμων ὁάροις, nor is it possible here to meet the objection by saying that the adjective belongs in poetic effect with ἀνέμων, as it really does in the properly-constituted text. But the best criticism on V. here consists in quoting Leo, whose critical method in treating both the manuscripts and the poetical conception is far stricter. L. writes: τοῦ καλλιάνου τ' ἐπὶ Κηφισοῦ ῥοαῖς τὰν Κύπριν κλήζουσιν ἐφεζομένην χώραν κατὰ πνεύσαι μετρίας ἀνέμων ἡδυνήνοισι ἄνρας, αἰεὶ δ' ἐπιβαλλομένην χαίταισιν εὐδὼν ῥοδέων πλόκον ἀνθέων τᾷ Σοφίᾳ παρέδρους πέμπειν ἔρωτας, παντοίας ἀρετᾶς ξυνεργούς. "Die am Kephisos sitzende Kypris, sich kränzend und Erosen entsendend, ist die Hauptfigur des Gemäldes; in ihrer Begleitung Sophia, mit Erosen zur Seite. Harmonia mit den Musen und die διὰ λαμπροτάτων αἰθέρος wandelnden Athener gruppieren sich von selbst im Geiste des Hörers dazu. Die landschaftlichen Züge (der heilige Boden, die Reinheit der Luft, der Fluss, die lauen

Winde, der Blumenreichthum) geben den Hintergrund. Man schlägt sich schwer des Gedankens, dass das Gemälde topographische Grundlage habe; auch Sophokles im Liede auf den Kolonos nennt Musen und Aphrodite im Kephisosgebiete (O. C. 685 ff.), worauf schon Elmsley aufmerksam machte." *This* does seem to the reviewer thoroughly convincing, with a single exception: the relation of the Ἐρωτες to the other figures is confused. It is very easy to assume a mistake in the termination of παρέδρους. I should write πάρεδρον: the Ἐρωτες go forth with a joint commission from Aphrodite and Sophia.

The treatment of 846-7 is an unfavorable specimen of V.'s skill. He writes: *ιερῷ ποταμῷ ἢ φίλῳ ἢ πόλιν πόμπιμός σε χάρα.* Here V. fancies there must be some mystery behind the corrupt reading of the Vaticanus—*ἢ φίλων ἢ πόλιν*. But the corruption is of the most simple and usual sort—a transposition of words (helped by the repetition of ἢ) in the archetype of this and other MSS. The reading of Laur. and Pal. is not a "rough remedy to the metre," but the true reading, with a clear and obvious sense. But even if the soundness of this far-fetched method were conceded, we could not accept V.'s result. He regards φίλῳ as a "secondary predicate" with ποταμῷ "like the participle in *οὐ μοι βουλομένῳ τοῦτο ποιήσεις.*" To this it is a sufficient objection to say that the position of ἢ is impossible. It is true enough that ἢ takes unusual positions sometimes, but it always heads a clause or precedes a word antithetical to some other word. In dealing with the word πόμπιμός, V. tries to show that it may be exactly covered by the English *hospitable*—a view not adequately supported by his citations. It cannot be denied, however, that the expression φίλων πόμπιμός calls for some explanation not yet given by the commentators. I conceive that the φίλων can only refer to the Corinthian state. The chorus allude (and only allude) to the certainty of a pursuit which the Athenians will be bound to speed and assist. And I find that Musgrave had at least a similar notion of the needs of the passage. He says: "legendum putem *ποίνιμός, ultrix, vindex amicorum.*" His new coinage was not necessary, but his idea was sound. It may be objected that the allusion suggested is too obscure; but the position of *σε* is such as to create an antithesis between *σε* and φίλων. The following *μετ' ἄλλων* is surely very suspicious, but it is hard to take V.'s suggestion of *μεταλλῶ* seriously. The palaeographic perfection of Elmsley's *μεθ' ἄγνων* is tempting, but misleading. An infinitive in place of these words would improve the passage; but nothing in the *ductus litterarum* guides me to such an infinitive. The paraphrases of the scholia point not indistinctly to a *δέχεσθαι*. This would be a perfect reading, and, supposing it genuine, it would be quite possible to account for the corruption; still I am afraid no such reading can ever be proved genuine. A simple and fairly satisfactory remedy would be to write *συνούσαν*, but I have little faith in it.

856-9 are thus presented: *πῶθεν θράσος ἢ φρενὸς ἢ χειρὶ σέθεν τέχραν καρδίᾳ τε λήψει δεινὰν προσάγουσα τόλμαν.* Here, I think, the τέχραν must be accepted as a genuine restoration; but no explanation can make the pairing of *χειρὶ* with *καρδίᾳ* seem tolerable. Kayser's correction (*σὺν* for *τε* in 858) is as certain as a correction can be, and gives to the *προσάγουσα τόλμαν* its indispensable "remoter object."

In 887 V. writes *καὶ ξυννυμναεῖν καὶ παρεστάναι λέχει.* One would like to accept *ξυννυμναεῖν* with the reasoning offered in support of it, but it is impos-

sible. First let us hear V. "The MSS readings are alternative corrections of $\xi\upsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ where $\xi\upsilon\mu\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ is a corruption, $\xi\upsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ a gloss." . . . "It is utterly improbable that the subtle and significant $\xi\upsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ is the unprompted invention of a copyist." But the hard fact is, that $\xi\upsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ is the reading of the Laurentianus, $\xi\upsilon\mu\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ of all the other manuscripts; and the agreement of the Palatinus with the Vaticanus practically proves the conclusion that $\xi\upsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ never had a place in any text older than the Laurentianus—that it is a corruption due solely to the copyist who wrote that manuscript. It is most likely that the archetype had the $\xi\upsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ in the form of a gloss; but the Palatinus proves conclusively that the regular reading of this same archetype was $\xi\upsilon\mu\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$. But let us assume for the moment that $\xi\upsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ once existed as a gloss in the archetypes of all existing MSS. What word did it explain? It would be a very bad explanation, at least in its ancient sense, for $\xi\upsilon\nu\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\acute{\iota}\epsilon\iota\nu$. Perhaps not very much better, but surely quite as good, for $\xi\upsilon\mu\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$. Finally, $\xi\upsilon\nu\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\acute{\iota}\epsilon\iota\nu$ gives a rhythm which is hardly admissible for the Medea.

In 890 V. writes $\chi\rho\eta\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\omicron\mu\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, finding in this the common origin of all the readings of the MSS. I cannot agree with him. It is plain that the archetypal manuscripts of both classes gave $\chi\rho\eta\nu$. The reading of the Vaticanus, $\epsilon\acute{\chi}\rho\eta\nu\ \sigma'\ \epsilon\acute{\xi}\omicron\mu\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, must have originated as a suprascript explanation in plain prose for the $\chi\rho\eta\nu\ \sigma'\ \delta\omicron\mu\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ of the text. The much-vexed 910 appears in this form: $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\nu\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\mu\pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\lambda\alpha\iota\omicron\nu\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\omicron}\sigma\epsilon\iota$, with the translation: *For it is natural for the sex to show ill humor against a spouse when he traffics in contraband love.* But I think Prinz's statement, *nondum emendatus*, must still stand.

914-15 V. writes $\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\iota\ \delta\acute{\epsilon},\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\iota\delta\epsilon\varsigma,\ \omicron\nu\kappa\ \acute{\alpha}\phi\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$, | $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\eta\ \delta'\ \epsilon\theta'\ \eta\acute{\xi}\epsilon\iota\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$. This must be greeted as a very beautiful restoration—methodical, precise, complete, convincing.

Again at 942 V.'s proceeding is highly satisfactory. Bettering a hint given by Prinz, he changes $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ into $\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ without other change, omitting, of course, 943.

In 983-4 V. gives $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\omicron\nu$ and $\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\nu$ —a departure, I think, though a trifling one, from strict method.

The treatment of 1076-7— $\omicron\nu\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\tau'\ \epsilon\iota\mu\iota\ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\nu\ \omicron\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \tau'\ \epsilon\theta'\ \iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ —is sober and sound, where previous editors have been content with seeing each some insufficient bit of the obvious and simple truth.

In 1087-8 V. prints $\pi\alpha\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu\ \delta\acute{\epsilon},\ \tau\acute{\iota}\ \omega\eta,\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, a change which will probably find few friends. V. should not have cited Soph. Ai. 668 in support of his $\tau\acute{\iota}\ \mu\acute{\eta}$. The words stand there, but hardly in the sense of $\tau\acute{\iota}\ \gamma\grave{\alpha}\rho\ \omicron\nu$. A very simple correction occurs to me, though I cannot find that any critic has suggested it: $\pi\alpha\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu\ \delta'\ \epsilon\tau\iota\ \delta\eta\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$. To this there is an obvious, but I believe not a serious objection. The idea suggested seems on the whole natural and appropriate, and the corruptions of the MSS are of a character to compel consideration of this reading.

In 1174 we find again a masterly correction— $\delta\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu\ \tau'\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$. About this reading the reviewer has been at the pains to consult an experienced physician, who explains that upward rolling of the eyeballs is not at all a characteristic "symptom of fainting" (so V.), though a very marked symptom of *convulsion*.

But it is ungrateful to pick small flaws in the explanation of so fine an emendation.

1183-4 V. writes: ἡ δ' ἐξ ἀνάγκου καὶ μύσαντος ὁμματος | δεινὸν στενάξας ἡ τάλαν' ἀνωμμάτων. This is not bad, in spite of possible objections. One cannot feel quite sure about ἀνωμμάτων, but it is at least sensible and possible. And there can be no question that V. is right in calling ἀπώλλυτο a corruption and ἡγείρετο a gloss (or a conjecture).

1194, ἐλάπτετο for ἐλάμπτετο does not commend itself.

1221, ποθαινῇ δὴ κλύουσι συμφόρα, "a tale, is it not, that one may yearn to hear?" a reproachful allusion to Medea's eagerness for the recital." Upon this I withhold my comments.

1234 presents another case of over-subtlety—εἰς "Αἰδου πέλας, a reading almost as difficult as it is ill-supported.

1242-3, τί μέλλομεν; | τί δεινὰ τάναγκαῖα; μὴ πράσσειν κακόν, which may be accepted with very little reserve.

1268-70, ὁμογενὴ μιάσματ', ἐτι τ' αἰὲν αὐτοφόνταισιν οἶδα θεῶθεν πίτνοντ' ἐπὶ δόμοις ἄχῃ. The best criticism upon this is to place beside it Leo's restoration: ὁμογενὴ μιάσματ' ἔπεται δ' ἅμ' αὐτοφόνταις ξυνωδὰ θεῶθεν πίτνοντ' ἐπὶ δόμοις ἄχῃ.

1346 V. writes τέχνην μαιφόνε and translates the line, *Go artist in villainy and murderess by trade*. He cites the analogy of λογχοποιός, etc., to show that the termination -ποιός is characteristic of the names of trades, as a justification of αἰσχροποιός, "which but for this analogy would be miserably inadequate." He goes entirely too far in denying the possibility of such an expression as τέκνων μαιφόνε. The note upon the passage is very engagingly written; and there is little doubt that V.'s view will find favor in many quarters. For my part, I have no doubt the MSS give us the line in its original form, and still less doubt that Euripides never wrote nor heard of a word of it. The line is a ridiculous "gag" invented by an actor whose words were larger than he could manage. By the way, the scholion to this passage is worth notice. Dindorf prints it: ὅτι δοκεῖ τὸν στίχον τοῦτον εἰπὼν Εὐριπίδης ἐκβεβλήσθαι· διὸ καὶ κεχίσασται. That is meaningless: read ἐκβεβλήσθαι ἂν. In 1369 κακὴ for κακά—a doubtful improvement. In 1380, ὥς μὴ τις αὐτοῦ πολέμιων καθυβρίσῃ. But the line calls for no emendation: a sound reading in one class of manuscripts and a slight slip in the other is no evidence of corruption.

Occasionally V. fails to notice an older correction which seems certain—κάμπροῶν (Prinz), 334 is an example.

We may speak more briefly of V.'s treatment of interpolations. He brackets or prints at the foot of the page (in most cases following earlier critics) the following lines: 12, 40, 41, 42, 43, 246, 262, 466, 468, 470, 732, 778, 782, 913, 933, 943, 1006, 1062, 1063, 1225, 1226, 1227, 1284, 1285, 1288, 1289, 1359.

In regard to the spuriousness of most of these verses V. may be sure of the nearly unanimous assent of scholars who know Euripides. But it is difficult to see why he should be blind to the character of several other verses whose base origin has been shown by arguments as conclusive as have ever been adduced against any one of those he condemns. 1068 is as good an example as any. In this case he thinks it "difficult to account for" an interpolation. Whoever wrote that verse obviously intended to heighten the effect of the passage. But he did obviously alter and debase the effect. The motive might

have been active with Euripides himself or with an enterprising actor. But Euripides was a man of genius, who had elaborately created the scene, unlikely to be mistaken or uncertain about the real effect he sought. The line belongs to the well-recognized class of creations due to the theatrical companies. In regard to a number of other verses V. expresses doubts, often less definitely than might be wished. In regard to the repeated lines I cannot always accept his judgment. For example, he rejects 1062-3 and retains 1240-1. It is surely a slip when he says the children are present while 1060 ff. are spoken. In view of 1019-20 this cannot be. Occasionally the critical knife makes something less than a clean cut. This is notably the case with 12. The line is spurious, as has been repeatedly pointed out; but very little is gained by rejecting it alone. It cannot be too often repeated that in a piece known to be interpolated, if evidences of interpolation at any given place be detected, the presumptions in regard to the length of the insertion are very slight. There is no logic behind the rule, which many critics seem to regard, that an interpolation of one line must be thought twice as probable as one of two lines, and so on in the same ratio. The theatrical companies in their day foisted upon Euripides one whole play with a spare prologue.

Of the explanatory notes much good might be said. They are careful, in the main sympathetic, sometimes suggestive, and will be read with interest by scholars. But it can hardly be said that they add very much to our knowledge. Perhaps it would not be fair to expect this; but the commentator, when he comes, who really *explains* the construction of οὐ μή, 1151, will have an achievement to boast of. An example of over-refinement is the note on 32, where it is objected that Medea, on quitting her home, "arrived not at Corinth but at Iolkos." And there is an occasional vagueness, not to say inaccuracy in some of the statements and translations. So 35, *what virtue there is in cleaving to the fatherland*—the voice of ἀπολείπεσθαι is left unpleasantly in doubt. In 240, ὅτῳ υἱόιστα χρήσεται ξυνεννέτη, *wherewith she may best manage a husband*, seems to the reviewer a translation of an emended text. But V. says "the conjecture ὅπως for ὅτῳ is scarcely necessary, ὅτῳ being instrumental. Examples of so rare an instrumental would be welcome. It seems a Meineke did not know where to find one. In general V. seems a little too easily satisfied with expressions for which a name can be found in Kühner's Grammar, a little too easily disturbed when this name is lacking. An example of the latter sort is 1143, treated in an addendum. It is quite true, but not very strange, that στέγας has nothing, at least within the usage of tragic dialogue, to govern it. Some regard must be paid to the special style of the speaker. The ἄγγελοι, παιδαγωγοί, etc., regularly speak in a resonant and slightly confused way. Nothing more natural than for such a character to put the accusative πρὸς τὸ νοούμενον and then to vary slightly from his original intention in choosing a verb of motion. 1256, θεοῦ δ' αἵματι πίτνειν φόβος ὑπ' ἀνέρων—the *blood of gods is in peril of being shed by man*. To say nothing of αἵματι, nor of the absurdity involved in this rendering, was Euripides really so ignorant of his "Moods and Tenses"? The misunderstanding is not new (nor the correction of it); but φόβος πίτνειν and φόβος μὴ πίπτει are not interchangeable.

In minor details the book has received commendable care. Perhaps it would be well if editors could decide whether Euripides wrote ξὺν or σὺν; but I

believe all editors are alike indifferent to the matter. Some forms, like *σῶζω* and *οἱ μέν* (87), now seem a trifle old-fashioned. The publishers for their part could hardly have done more than they have.

J. H. WHEELER.

An Etymology of Latin and Greek. By CHARLES S. HALSEY, A. M. Boston : Ginn, Heath & Co. 1882.

The title-page of this little work should have read somewhat as follows : An Essay by Dr. Maurice Bloomfield, divided into two parts, between which parts are inserted most of the Etymologies given in Curtius' *Griechische Etymologie* (before it was revised for the 5th edition), preceded by the greater part of Dr. Maurice Bloomfield's review of Meyer's *Griechische Grammatik*; besides these, twenty pages of matter extracted from various text-books; *plus* a chapter of one page, a list of roots, and three long indices, the last by Charles S. Halsey, A. M. This we believe to be fairer than the present title. We do not mean to say that the author has surreptitiously borrowed from other authors; but no one who had not seen this Journal for September, 1880, could guess how much lies hidden under the remark, "I have given the statement of those chapters condensed mainly from his (Dr. Bloomfield's) paper on the Greek Ablaut"; and again, "The Preliminary Statement is condensed from his article," etc. What does Mr. Halsey mean by 'mainly,' what by 'condensed'? There is not an idea in these chapters that is not expressed in the very words used by Dr. Bloomfield in the Journal a year ago. 'Mainly' means here 'wholly'; 'condensed' means copied and bisected, with here and there an omission.

We have now to examine the plan of the work. The author intends this book to supply a "felt want," for in the chance etymologies of school lexica "no connected systematic or thorough knowledge of etymology is acquired" (Preface, p. iii). This is very true. Let us now see how the author undertakes to give the young student the first ideas of "systematic" etymology. We must bear in mind that the work is intended for beginners, for such indeed as have "no knowledge of the Greek language" (p. xv). In the first twenty pages the author runs over the main facts of relationship between the I. E. languages. We notice on p. 2 that Armenian is unhesitatingly classed as Eranian, that Sanskrit is regarded as derived from Vedic. Of Pali and dialects which may go back to Vedic, not as derivatives but as parallel growths, no mention is made. Every root is monosyllabic (p. 6). The principle which underlies the greater part of phonetic change is the tendency to ease of utterance (p. 16). These points are merely stated, not discussed, doubtless because in a work "for school use" it is undesirable to present conflicting views (p. xiv). Why then do we have the "principles of the new school" set forth in the language of a scholar, and with such technical form that no schoolboy in America could follow the ideas given for two pages together? Why are twenty pages of general remarks followed by a learned essay on the Greek ablaut which can be of no possible interest to "such as have no knowledge of Greek," to such as those for whom the book is intended? This tacking together of disparate material shows itself in many details. So what Dr. Bloomfield calls *guna* is changed by